

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

A number of claims have been amended in such a way that the Applicant believes renders moot a number of objections cited by the Examiner as well as a 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

A number of claims were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being taught by TRAW et al (PGPub. #2002/0007452 A1) and under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being taught by Pasqualino (PGPub. # 2002/0163598 A1). Each of the references teach encrypting all the data transmitted between a source and sink (with TRAW, for example, see Fig. 6, that shows unencrypted content input to channel cipher subsystem 606 that encrypts all content being sent from the content source to the content sink which in this case is an IEEE 1394 bus).

In contrast, the invention as recited in claim 1 provides for encrypting only some of the data packets that are sent from the source to the sink. In particular, claim 1 recites, in part:

- forming a number of data packets at a source device;
- forming a first group of encrypted data packets by encrypting *some of the data packets* based upon a first set of encryption/decryption values, *wherein the number of encrypted data packets in the first group of encrypted data packets is less than the number of data packets formed at the source device*;
- transmitting the encrypted and unencrypted data packets from the source device to a sink device coupled thereto;
- decrypting the first group of encrypted data packets using the first set of encryption/decryption values; and
- accessing the decrypted and unencrypted data packets by the sink device.

In this way, only some of the data packets sent from the source to the sink are encrypted using a first set of encryption values in contrast to TRAW and Pasqualino where all data packets are encrypted. As a result, the Applicant does not believe that the invention as recited in claim 1 is anticipated by either of the cited references and is therefore allowable.

Independent claims 6 and 12 recite essentially the same limitations as claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable.

All remaining dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 6 and 12 and are also believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001